



HOWARD COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
*ELlicott CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT ■ LAWYERS HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT*  
3430 Courthouse Drive ■ Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

*Administered by the Department of Planning and Zoning*

www.howardcountymd.gov  
410-313-2350  
FAX 410-313-1655  
TDD 410-313-2323

## October Minutes

The ninth regular meeting for the year 2014 of the Historic Preservation Commission was held on Thursday, October 2, 2014 in the C. Vernon Gray Room located at 3430 Court House Drive, Ellicott City, Maryland.

Members present: Joseph Hauser, Chairperson; Lisa Badart; and Allan Shad

Members absent: Eileen Tennor

Staff present: Beth Burgess, Samantha Holmes, Lewis Taylor, Dan Bennett, and Carol Stirn

Chairman Hauser opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. with a statement explaining the process and rules of the meeting. Mr. Hauser moved to Approve the September 4, 2014 minutes. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

### **PLANS FOR APPROVAL**

1. 13-21c – 6802 Norris Lane, Elkridge, HO-454
2. 14-20c – 8469 Main Street, Ellicott City
3. 14-72 – 8143 Main Street, Ellicott City (continued from September)
4. 14-73 – 8267 Main Street, Ellicott City
5. 14-74 – 8370-8374 Main Street, Ellicott City
6. 14-75 – 8109-8113 Main Street, Ellicott City
7. 14-76 – 8133 Main Street, Ellicott City

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

#### **13-21c – 6802 Norris Lane, Elkridge, HO-454**

Final tax credit approval.

Applicant: Marisa and Mike McCurdy

**Background & Scope of Work:** On September 12, 2013 the Applicant was pre-approved to make repairs and exterior alterations to the house. The application states that \$65,700.00 was spent on eligible, pre-approved work. The Applicant seeks \$16,425.00 in final tax credits.

**Staff Comments:** The work complies with that pre-approved and the invoices add up to the requested amount.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends approval of final tax credit as submitted.

**Testimony:** There was no testimony.

**Motion:** Mr. Hauser moved to Approve. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

**14-20c – 8469 Main Street, Ellicott City**

Final tax credit approval.

Applicant: Margaret Andrews

**Background & Scope of Work:** On May 1, 2014 the Applicant was pre-approved to paint the exterior of the house and replace the existing metal gutters. The application states that \$10,500.00 was spent on eligible pre-approved work. The Applicant seeks \$2,625.00 in final tax credits.

**Staff Comments:** The work complies with that pre-approved and the invoices add up to the requested amount.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends approval of final tax credit as submitted.

**Testimony:** There was no testimony.

**Motion:** Mr. Hauser moved to Approve. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

**14-72 – 8143 Main Street, Ellicott City (continued from September)**

Install sign.

Applicant: Angelina Brannigan

**Background & Scope of Work:** This case has been continued from the September meeting in order to obtain more information on the proposed signs. The building dates to the mid-1980s and was built after the original building burned in 1984. The Applicant proposes to install a projecting sign from a black powder coated cast aluminum bracket. The sign will read on four lines:

Simply Divine  
Boutique  
of  
Ellicott City

The sign will connect to the bracket with eyehooks and S-hooks. The sign will be routed 1 ½ inch HDU (high density urethane) with v-carved text and border. The sign will be 28 inches high by 36 inches wide for a total of 7.6 square feet. The bracket will be 16 inches high by 40 inches wide.

**Staff Comments:** There is an existing bracket on the building from the previous tenant. The Applicant would like to lower and replace that bracket. The County Sign Code requires that projecting signs have a minimum clearance of 10 feet above the sidewalk. Staff has no objection to the bracket being lowered, as long as the sign complies with the clearance height.

The drawing provided is in black and white and does not specify where the color will be on the sign. The application indicates the background will be black and that there will be gold metallic and red or silver as accents, but does not specify where. Staff has requested a color rendering of the sign. The drawing also does not indicate if the sign is double-sided. Staff recommends the sign be double-sided, if it is not planned to be. Chapter 11.A recommends, “use a minimum number of colors, generally no more than

three. Coordinate sign colors with the colors used in the building façade.” Staff requires more information on this item.

The text on the sign complies with Chapter 11.A (page 80) recommendations, “use simple, legible words and graphics” and “keep letters minimum and the message brief and to the point.” The text also complies with Chapter 11.A (page 80) recommendations, “use lettering that is between one-third and one-half of the sign height and covers no more than 75 percent of the face of the sign.”

The sign will be on modern material, but the high density foam is designed to look like wood. Therefore, Staff finds the application complies with Chapter 11.A recommendations, “use historically appropriate materials such as wood or iron for signs and supporting hardware.”

Chapter 11.B of the Guidelines recommends, “use only one projecting or hanging sign per building.” This will be the only sign on the building. The Guidelines also recommend (page 84), “limit the sign area to be in scale with the building. Projecting or hanging signs of four to six square feet are appropriate for many of Ellicott City’s small, attached commercial buildings.” The sign will be slightly larger than the recommended size, but the building is also larger than some of the historic buildings so the scale is still appropriate.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval, contingent upon receiving a color drawing of the sign and appropriate use of colors.

**Testimony:** Ms. Holmes stated that she spoke with the Applicant for this case, and the Applicant withdrew the case in order to work on further refining the sign, and she will submit another application at a later date. The Applicant did email the withdrawal in writing to Ms. Holmes.

#### **14-73 – 8267 Main Street, Ellicott City**

Exterior alterations.

Applicant: Richard Lee, Howard County Department of Public Works

**Background & Scope of Work:** The building dates to 1940. The Applicant proposes to replace the existing black metal railings on the staircase and ADA ramp with a more appropriate accessible railing. The Applicant also proposes to replace the existing front lanterns, which are in poor condition. The light posts will remain.

The existing railings are corroded and in poor condition. The Applicant will replace the railings on the stairs and ADA ramp with continuous side rails, which are ADA compliant.

The lanterns will be replaced with two new black metal LED light fixtures. The proposed lanterns will be 44 11/16 inches high by 19 5/16 wide. The lanterns will look very similar to the existing, but will be larger.

**Staff Comments:** The Guidelines do not specifically address hand railings, but fences are very similar in appearance and the Guidelines are applicable. Chapter 9.D recommends “install open fencing, generally not more than five feet high, of wood or dark metal” and “construct new site features using materials compatible with the setting and with nearby historic structures, particularly for features visible from a public way.” The new railings will be black metal and very similar to the existing rails, but with the addition of the second lower handrail.

The proposed lantern may be too large for the post. However the style of the lantern is very similar to

the existing. A correct sized lantern would comply with Chapter 9.E recommendations, “whenever possible, use a consistent design of light poles and fixtures within a given area of the historic district” and “when new streetlights or parking lot lights are needed, install traditional style, post-top fixture made of dark metal of a materials that resembles dark metal, particularly in highly visible locations.”

There are several other items referenced in the application, such as replacing broken slate pavers, repairing and repainting the door frame and repairing the concrete gutter. However, these items are Routine Maintenance as no changes are being made and do not require approval.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval as submitted, contingent upon using a correctly sized lantern top.

**Testimony:** The Applicant was not present. Ms. Holmes summarized the Staff comments. She explained that one issue is that the initial size for the globes was too large. DPW has now issued two new specs for the globes and is open to the decision made by the Commission. Ms. Holmes stated the new railing will also contain the ADA second rail. Staff and the Commission discussed the proposed work and the size of the globes.

**Motion:** Ms. Badart moved to Approve per Staff recommendations, except the stipulation for the globes will be the 28 inch version. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

#### **14-74 – 8370-8374 Main Street, Ellicott City**

Exterior alterations and repairs, tax credit pre-approval. Façade Improvement Program funds.

Applicant: William F. Bishop

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to MDAT the building dates to 1920. Due to a miscommunication through the grant from the Ellicott City Historic District Partnership, where this project is being funded from, this building has already been painted. However, it was not the intent of the owner to paint the building the new color prior to receiving a Certificate of Approval or Tax Credit Pre-Approval.

The Applicant proposes to paint the front façade trim, re-stain the front door, replace the exterior light fixture and the building metal address numbers. The Applicant proposed to paint the trim a dark sage green called Benjamin Moore Lush (AF-475) to match the color on 8370 Main Street and the roof. There were two shades of green on the building; 8370 Main Street had a dark sage green color while 8374 Main Street was a light mint green color. The intent of the new color was to maintain the overall general appearance and unify the building with one color.

The application states that the light fixture will be replaced with a new copper fixture, as the existing fixture is in poor condition. However, the Applicant informed Staff that has decided to paint the existing fixture black. New address number will be added to the front door to read ‘8370-8374.’ The proposed address numbers will be cast brass with an antique brass finish.

The application also indicates that the gutters will be replaced, but the Applicant has decided just to paint them the new color instead. The front door will be re-stained to match the existing.

The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval and Façade Improvement Program funds for the work.

**Staff Comments:** The new paint color is very similar to the previous colors, but is a richer shade of

green. The color complies with Chapter 6.N recommendations, “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings...In general, use calm or subdued colors, reserving bright colors for small, important details, such as doors or trim.” The new green is also similar to a color approved last month for the neighboring building.

If the Applicant decides to use a new light, it complies with Chapter 9.E recommendations, “place attached lighting fixtures in traditional locations next to or over a door.” However, painting the light black complies with Chapter 9.E (page 71) recommendations, “use dark metal or a similar material.” The antique brass finish for the address numbers will be compatible with the aged copper finish of the exterior light.

The painting of the front façade of the building is mainly being paid for by a grant from the Ellicott City Historic District Partnership. Due to a miscommunication, the building has already been painted the new color. This property is no longer eligible for the tax credit for painting, as the tax credit does require pre-approval from the Commission, per the County code.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval as submitted. Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval for the painting of the existing lantern or a replacement lantern, new address numbers and staining of the front door.

**Façade Improvement Program:** Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic District Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, and availability of funds and receipt of two bids for each scope of work. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete.

**Testimony:** Mr. Hauser swore in Gilbert Bishop. Mr. Hauser asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Bishop stated the comments were fairly accurate; he said he had no additional comments. Mr. Hauser asked if Mr. Bishop had any comments regarding the application. Mr. Bishop stated there was some confusion on obtaining additional State funding. Mr. Bishop said that he is representing his father, William Bishop.

Mr. Bishop stated the façade was already painted, but would like to continue painting the remainder of the building and receive the benefits. Mr. Bishop asked if there was a timeframe to get it completed. Ms. Burgess stated tax credits were applied for on the façade, but not the entire building. Mr. Hauser said that tax credits could be given for an expanded project, but that a new application would need to be submitted for the next meeting. Ms. Burgess commented that if the entire building had been included in the present application, then the painting could have continued. Mr. Bishop asked if two state licensed contractors are still required for the new application. Ms. Holmes stated that two bids are not required for tax credits, but is only required for the Façade Improvement Program, but that the contractors do have to be licensed. Ms. Badart asked if the application needs to stipulate that it does not include the façade. Ms. Holmes said that was correct, that the scope of work must state that the front of the building is not included. Mr. Bishop asked about the tax credits for the new application and if it would apply to year 2015. Ms. Holmes stated the work needs to be completed and brought back for final approval. She explained that if the information is brought back before May for final approval, tax credits will be applied in July of 2015. Mr. Hauser explained that a payment verification must be shown and submitted with the final tax credit application. The contractor must be licensed in order to receive tax credits.

Mr. Taylor clarified that the present application included retroactive approval for the painting, which was done inadvertently without knowing the process, but not for tax credits. Staff agreed that was

correct.

**Motion:** Ms. Badart moved to Approve as per Staff recommendations. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

**14-75 – 8109-8113 Main Street, Ellicott City**

Exterior alterations and repairs, tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Travis Johnson

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to MDAT the buildings date to 1900. The Applicant proposes to make several exterior repairs and alterations to the building and seeks tax credit pre-approval for the work.

**8109 Main Street**

The Applicant proposes to paint the side of the building visible to Main Street, using the recently painted green and blue colors (Benjamin Moore Seedling AF-450 and Mysterious AF-565) that are on the front façade from the Benjamin Moore project. There is one exterior wall that will remain white, but will be updated with the blue trim. This wall is not visible from the public right-of-way. The back of the building will have all vines and weeds encroaching upon the building removed prior to painting. The Applicant also proposes to repair the roof and flashing around the exterior door.

**8113 Main Street**

The side of the building that is visible to Main Street will be painted Benjamin Moore Brush Beige and Prussian Blue to match the front façade of the building, which was painted as part of the Benjamin Moore project. The Applicant proposes to replace the existing skylight with a clear double dome skylight.

**Staff Comments:** Typically this application would be heard in two separate cases as it is two different building facades. However, the buildings are under the same tax account information so the tax credits will be heard as one case.

The painting complies with Chapter 6.N recommendations, “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings...In general, use calm or subdued colors, reserving bright colors for small, important details, such as doors or trim.” Once the sides of the buildings are painted, the colors will all match and the number of colors used on the buildings will be minimized.

The repairs to the roof and flashing around the exterior alley door would be considered Routine Maintenance, as Chapter 6.E (page 33) defines as, “repairing roofs, including the replacement of small areas of roofing material, using material similar to the existing roofing in dimensions, shape, color and texture.”

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit approval for all work, except the replacement of the non-historic skylight.

Ms. Holmes gave an update on the roof. The issue with the roof is not exactly routine maintenance. The applicant emailed the roof is a red metal roof and additional roofing will be added to cover a cut-out in the back of the building. The roofing company has been contacted multiple times and has not yet replied.

**Testimony:** Mr. Hauser swore in Jennifer Johnson. Ms. Johnson is the mother of Travis Johnson and one of the owners of the property; she is representing Mr. Johnson at the meeting. Mr. Hauser asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Ms. Johnson stated the roofer was finally contacted and she passed out a sample of the roof color, Colonial Red. Ms. Johnson stated she was given information about the vines, the colors, the painting, and the skylight. Ms. Holmes asked for a further explanation of the roof issue. Ms. Johnson said there is a ridge in the back which had water leaking in and that there is a gutter and flashing which will be repaired to match the existing metal roof. Ms. Johnson also passed out pictures of the skylight. The skylight does not leak at this time, but it is old and needs replacing in order to prevent leaks.

**Motion:** Mr. Hauser moved to Approve as submitted and per Staff recommendations that the skylight is exempt from tax credit pre-approval. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

#### **14-76 – 8133 Main Street, Ellicott City**

Retroactive sign approval.

Applicant: Sam Coyne

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to MDAT the building dates to 1900. The Applicant seeks retroactive approval to install 4 signs on the building, which currently has a zoning violation for the signs. The signs include one projecting sign, two flat mounted signs, and one flat mounted doorplate.

The projecting sign reads on three lines:

)(  
CRAIG COYNE  
You Ware

The projecting sign is 24 inches high by 24 inches wide for a total of 4 square feet. This sign has a black background with gold text and is double sided. The sign is aluminum and hangs from a previously existing black metal bracket.

There are two flat mounted signs, located on the sides of the building, inside wood panels. The signs read vertically “FINE” and “JEWELRY”. The signs have a black background and gold text. Each sign is 48 inches high by 7 inches wide for a total of 2.33 square feet. The signs are also made out of aluminum.

The fourth sign is a small brass doorplate that contains the store hours and days of operation. The sign is 4.5 inches high by 24 inches wide for a total of .75 square feet.

**Staff Comments:** Chapter 11.B (page 82) recommends against, “two signs where one is sufficient to provide an easily visible identification of the business” and “more than two signs per business per façade.” The Applicant proposes to use four total signs on the front façade, which does not comply with the recommendations. While the doorplate sign containing the business hours does require approval, Staff finds it is too small to consider an actual business sign, but the three remaining signs do not comply. Chapter 11.B (page 81-82) explains, “most buildings should not have more signs than uses or occupants. In a few cases a location may call for two signs for a business. When the two signs are on the same building façade, the best combination will often be one flat-mounted or windows sign and one projecting sign. Multiple signs need to be coordinated so that the cumulative effect does not clutter or obscure the building façade.” While more than one sign may be needed on large buildings, this building is small and is overwhelmed by three signs.

The application does not comply with Chapter 11.A, which recommends (page 80), “emphasize the

identification of the establishment rather than an advertising message on the face of the sign” and “use historically appropriate materials such as wood or iron for signs and supporting hardware.” The ‘FINE’ and ‘JEWELRY’ signs are flat mounted at pedestrian level and stand out as a modern material against the wood paneled storefront. Chapter 11.A (page 80) recommends, “use a minimum number of colors, generally no more than three. Coordinate sign colors with the colors used in the building façade.” In an email correspondence earlier this summer, the Applicant indicated the signs were temporary to get through the holidays and later, the Benjamin Moore project. The Applicant had expressed interest in matching the signs to the colors chosen by Benjamin Moore. The ‘FINE JEWELRY’ side signs detract from the building facade. The projecting sign is high and small enough that the different colors and modern material are not as noticeable.

The projecting sign complies with Chapter 11.B recommendations, “in most cases, limit the area of signage to one-half square foot of sign area for each linear foot of primary street frontage, with a limit of eight square feet in area for any one sign.” The projecting sign also complies with Chapter 11.A recommendations, “use simple, legible words and graphics” and “emphasize the identification of the establishment, rather than an advertising message on the face of the sign.”

The brass doorplate sign complies with Chapter 11.A (page 80) recommendations, “use historically appropriate materials for signs, such as wood or iron for signs and supporting hardware.”

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval of the hanging sign and door plate sign with store hours. Staff recommends denial of the ‘Fine Jewelry’ side panel signs.

**Testimony:** Mr. Hauser swore in Sam Coyne. Mr. Hauser asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Coyne referred to the Staff comments that mentioned where there was interest in matching the signs to the Benjamin Moore paint colors. Mr. Coyne stated he did not personally choose the colors used. Mr. Coyne also requested and paid for the second floor of his building to be painted. Mr. Coyne feels the colors do contrast, but does not think they clash. He said it is not an option to not use the logo colors as the corporate image is based on these colors.

Mr. Hauser asked Staff about their comments regarding the three larger signs not complying. Mr. Hauser said that the hanging sign is fine. Ms. Holmes explained that the hanging sign is not as noticeable as the two flat mounted signs, but having three total signs does not comply with the Guidelines. Mr. Coyne stated using the three signs was not a new idea; these sign placements were already on the building from the previous business in the exact same spots. The signs are made to be seen by pedestrians, not traffic. The words ‘Fine Jewelry’ could not be fit onto the hanging sign and still be visible to pedestrians. Ms. Badart stated she finds the hanging sign compatible and has no objections to it. The brass door sign is discrete. Ms. Badart agrees with Staff that the ‘Fine Jewelry’ signs in the panels seem out of character and inconsistent. Mr. Shad had no additional comments on the signs.

Mr. Coyne asked if it would be possible to obtain a variance to make the single hanging sign larger to more correctly identify the business. When the dimensions were given to the sign company for the current sign, the font had to be very small and it was not readable by pedestrians. Ms. Badart asked if the goal is to add ‘Fine Jewelry’ to the hanging sign. Mr. Coyne would like to add those words and maybe a bit more. There are many jewelry stores and adding Fine Jewelry would distinguish the store as a high-end shop, not a bead shop. Ms. Holmes stated the regulations recommend signs to be 4 to 6 square feet so it may be possible to expand the sign and add a bit more black space to the sides as ‘Craig Coyne’ is right up against the sign edge; there is a lot of vertical blank space but not horizontal space. The wording Fine Jewelry could be added below. Mr. Hauser added the sign does not have to be limited to the end of the bracket; it can extend out a bit further. Mr. Hauser swore in Joshua Haupt. Mr. Haupt stated the signs were already hanging before the building was painted. The owner said he was was told



that the paint being selected for the building would correlate with the signs. Ms. Holmes said that she was with Ms. Haley Woods from Benjamin Moore at the time the colors were presented to Mr. Coyne and that he was asked if the colors were ok and there was an option to use any color preferred. Ms. Holmes also stated that adding signs without approval is really the problem, as this could have been avoided. Mr. Coyne commented the colors are not really what he would have chosen, but they do blend in with the area.

Mr. Hauser requested to ask some legal advice and moved to go into closed session, off the record. Ms. Badart seconded. The applicants were asked to leave the room for a short time. The meeting went into closed session to obtain legal advice regarding signage. The meeting went back into session and the Applicants were brought back into the room.

Mr. Hauser asked about the corporate colors. Mr. Coyne stated the color is technically a very dark green. He explained the color is a Pantone color specifically chosen and when seen through a monitor the color appears to be a very dark green, but for magazines, newspaper and print the color shows as black. Ms. Holmes clarified that Staff and the Commission had no objection to the existing projecting sign, or making it larger to add the wording 'Fine Jewelry'. Mr. Coyne said he does not wish to remove the 'Fine Jewelry' as it identifies the business.

Mr. Hauser asked if there was a way to expand the hanging sign to add Fine Jewelry and make it look nice. Mr. Coyne stated yes, but at a high cost which he does not wish to spend. Mr. Hauser explained there is a problem with the look of the signs and with setting the precedent of the four signs. Ms. Badart stated the signs are out of proportion with the building size. She agrees with Staff that there are too many signs. Mr. Coyne asked about making a larger sign which protrudes from the building. Ms. Badart stated the recommended size be 4 to 6 square feet, and adding 50% to the existing 4 square feet size would make it within the recommended sizes. She suggested making the sign wider would give a broader border around the text. Mr. Coyne said he has worked every type scenario to make the sign work with the font size in order to be readable and that would not work.

Ms. Holmes made a suggestion about painting 'Fine Jewelry' in a darker color on top of the lighter panel color. Mr. Coyne stated this has been attempted but the wording cannot be read; the words would need to be outlined in another color to be readable. The Commission discussed different colors. Mr. Hauser suggested removing the blue panels and painting a fine lettering in the black with a fine gold outlining. Mr. Coyne expressed concerned about the durability of the paint.

Mr. Taylor clarified a statement Mr. Coyne said about fonts. Mr. Taylor asked if the wording of 'Craig Coyne' and 'Fine Jewelry' does not look right on the existing sign. Mr. Coyne explained that along with the spacing for each letter there needs to be a space between each word, plus add spacing on either side of the phrase by the border. Mr. Taylor said if the sign is 50% larger there is space for extra characters, so the font size could be made larger. Ms. Badart stated potentially both Craig Coyne and Fine Jewelry could be larger fonts. Mr. Coyne asked that the size of the sign can protrude past the end of the bracket. Both Staff and the Commission discussed different measurements and gave Mr. Coyne the amount in inches the size could protrude out, both as the additional 50% and what the maximum would be. The sign edge needs to be away from the building by six inches to clear the storefront cornice.

Mr. Coyne asked if he would have to come back to the HDC regarding changing the sign. Ms. Burgess stated no, if an agreement is reached now and the set requirements are followed, then Mr. Coyne does not have to return. Mr. Coyne asked if keeping the current sign and removing the Fine Jewelry is still an option. The Commission stated yes. Mr. Coyne stated he would need to obtain quotes on a bigger sign and the installation before a decision is made. Mr. Haupt questioned if something could be worked out for the three signs. Mr. Taylor stated there are legal criteria which the Commission should apply to the

Guidelines. When a case is heard, the criteria are applied. If one business is allowed to have more than what is stated in the Guidelines, then another business is told no, it can be challenged and taken to Court. It is within the Commission's authority to approve keeping the existing sign, but not the two panel signs, or replacing the existing sign with a new sign per specified criteria.

**Motion:** Mr. Hauser moved to retroactively Approve the hanging sign and the door sign. The two vertical signs are Denied and must be removed. The hanging sign will be allowed to expand out 50% of the current existing size. The Applicant must obtain an estimate and produce a design for the sign to bring in for Staff to review and give their approval. The Commission does not need to see the design. The new sign can include the wording Fine Jewelry. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

\*Chapter and page references are from the Ellicott City or Lawyers Hill Historic District Design Guidelines.

---

Beth Burgess, Executive Secretary

---

Joseph Hauser, Chairperson

---

Carol Stirn, Recording Secretary